

REMARKS

Specification/Drawings

23. The applicant has in this response amended this disclosure to comply with the examining attorney's objections under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). The applicant acknowledges he has used reference numbers (and the names of some parts) inconsistently between the drawings and the detailed description. However, while the examining attorney has objected to the drawings in this application, the numbering of the drawings is consistent among and between all drawings. Amendment to reference numbers (and names of parts) in the detailed description as corrected above should allow applicant to meet all requirements for consistency. Accordingly, consistent with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4), the same part of an invention appearing in more than one view of the drawing is always designated by the same reference character, and the same reference character is not, after amendment, used to designate different parts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

24. The applicant has with this amendment canceled claims 1-10, and presented new claims 11-20. The applicant believes all objections to the claims identified in the Office Action dated 11/28/2005 have been corrected in the new claims, and such objections are therefore now moot, and applicant therefore respectfully requests the examining attorney withdraw her rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

25. The examining attorney has rejected claim 1 as being anticipated by Phillips et al. (6,846,138). However, the applicant has amended his claims to further clarify the nature of his invention with the above-noted amendments. In light of such amendments, the applicant wishes to point out new independent claim 10 contains the limitation on the pad which comprises the sub-base of the present invention:

1 “iii. the pad is of substantially uniform thickness, and large enough to
2 cover substantially the entire lower surface of a router base to which
3 the pad may be attached, except the area of the lower surface of the
4 router base forward of the vertical front edge when the pad is so
5 attached.”
6

7 The portion of this limitation which is underlined, and which corresponds to the area of a
8 router forward of the vertical front edge 18 of applicant’s sub-base, is not found in Phillips et
9 al., and Phillips et al. in fact shows a “nose” extending from the sub-base of that invention
10 forward and around the area of the arbor (130). It is apparent from this construction of sub-
11 base in Phillips that the purpose of Phillips’ sub-base is to support the entire base of the router
12 shown in Phillips, and the construction of the sub-base in Phillips is consistent with this
13 purpose. It is also apparent that the construction of sub-base in Phillips would not allow a
14 user to move the Phillips router and sub-base evenly across the surface of a workpiece in the
15 same way a user may with applicant’s invention. Instead, Phillips is intended reposition the
16 center of gravity for an offset router, and provide better access to the edges of such pieces as
17 the cutting bit extends beyond the lower face of the sub-base, to better trim the edges of
18 workpieces. These purposes are shown in Phillips Fig. 11, and explained in Phillips by words
19 such as “providing greater access to perpendicular surfaces” (col. 1, lines 38-39), and “it
20 would be desirable to provide an offset base router...which is designed to allow access of the
21 offset base router to corners and other space limited areas” (col. 1, lines 45-50).

22 In light of the above additional limitation in his independent claim 11, the applicant believes
23 his invention as described in this claim is not anticipated by Phillips, and applicant’s
24 dependent claims contain all the limitations of his independent claim 11. Accordingly, the
25 applicant believes the examining attorney should withdraw his anticipation rejection based on
26 Phillips.
27
28

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)

26. The examining attorney has also rejected claims 2-5, and 8-10 as being unpatentable over Phillips et al. (6,846,138) in view of Judkins (4,461,330). As noted above, Phillips, after the amendment set forth herein, does not anticipate applicant's invention. The applicant therefore believes that the additional features found to be obvious (the substantially flat, substantially vertical surface 18 of former claim 2; the channel 15 of former claim 3, the depth and width of the channel of former claim 4, the offset router of former claim 5, and the method limitations of claims 8-10), should not be considered obvious in examination of new claims 11 through 20 where such determination depends on applicability of Phillips, *et al.* Accordingly, the applicant requests the examining attorney withdraw her rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

27. Moreover, the applicant believes Judkins is also inapplicable, whether as an anticipation or, in combination with other inventions, to make applicant's invention obvious. While Judkins calls for a "base plate" having a pair of generally parallel side faces 30 and 32 (Fig. 3, and col. 2, line 63) which are used to guide the router disclosed therein, the applicant has with the amendments set forth above added the limitation:

"ii. the pad is narrower at the front edge than at the back edge,"

This limitation is necessary to applicant's sub-base, as offset routers are generally semi-triangular in shape, so that the router may be used in corners. However, this limitation is entirely inconsistent with Judkins, which discloses an invention having a very different purpose, and specifically discloses parallel sides consistent with that purpose.

Conclusion

28. Reconsideration of the application as amended respectfully is requested. The applicant believes that the claims as amended are neither anticipated by prior references, nor obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art. For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance, and such action is requested.

Dated: May 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas W. Cook, Reg. No. 38,849
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone Number: 415-339-8550

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that the attached **Response to Office Action, Unnumbered Paper dated November 28, 2006** is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on May 27, 2006


Thomas Cook




CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

6 I hereby certify that the attached **Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a),**
7 **and \$510.00 filing fee** is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient
8 postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

8 Commissioner for Patents
9 P.O. Box 1450
10 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

11 on May 23 2006


Thomas Cook